United Nations E/AC.51/2001/4

Economic and Social Council

Distr.: General
4 May 2001

Original: English

Committee for Programme and Coordination
Forty-first session
11 June-6 July 2001
Item 4 (b) of the provisional agenda*
Programme questions: evaluation

Triennial review of the implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Coordination at its thirty-eighth session on the in-depth evaluation of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme

Note by the Secretary-General**

In conformity with General Assembly resolution 48/218 B of 29 July 1994 and with General Assembly resolution 54/244 of 23 December 1999, the Secretary-General has the honour to transmit the attached report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on triennial review of the implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Coordination at its thirty-eighth session on the in-depth evaluation of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme. The report has been reviewed by the relevant departments and offices. The Secretary-General takes note of its findings and concurs with its recommendations.

* E/AC.51/2001/1.
** Delayed in order to coordinate with other OIOS reports concerned with the Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention.

01-36014 (E) 010601

Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services on the triennial review of the implementation of the recommendations made by the Committee for Programme and Coordination at its thirty-eighth session on the in-depth evaluation of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme

Summary

The present report is submitted in accordance with the decision taken by the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) at its twenty-second session to review the implementation of its recommendations three years after taking a decision on an in-depth evaluation.

During the period under review, 1998-2000, the United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP) benefited from the successful outcome of the twentieth special session of the General Assembly, held in 1998. The action plans with specific goals and target dates adopted at the special session provided the strategic focus for drug control until the year 2008. Voluntary contributions to the UNDCP Fund increased during the preparatory process to the special session and the years that followed. As a result, UNDCP was able to plan a larger number of activities.

UNDCP programmes, well-established before 1998, continued to provide services that were appreciated by the recipients. Also, these programmes were able to develop new activities in response to changing priority needs. New programmes or programmes that needed to be significantiy enhanced — such as the global programmes for demand reduction and for the monitoring of illicit crops, as well as a number of country programmes — were implemented on a smaller scale than envisaged at first and did not have the expected impact.

UNDCP made an effort to follow through on the recommendations of CPC. Recommendations that required coordinated and continued effort, in particular, were not implemented in a manner that addressed the underlying problems identified in the 1998 evaluation. The coordination of collection and processing of information is still inadequate. The promotion of UNDCP as the main centre for concerted international action for drug abuse control should include a more sustained substantive dialogue with other organizations.

Contents

		Paragraphs	Page
I.	Introduction	1–4	4
II.	Findings	5–39	4
	A. Implementing the convention	5–13	4
	1. Monitoring implementation	5–7	4
	2. Assessments of implementation	8–9	5
	3. Modifying the scope of the conventions' schedules	10	6
	4. Global monitoring of additional measures recommended by the conventions	11–13	6
	B. Implementing the comprehensive strategies	14–31	7
	1. Gathering information from Governments	14–16	7
	2. Information-processing capacity of UNDCP	17–21	8
	3. Analytical activities and issues	22–23	10
	4. Advocacy	24–31	10
	C. Operational activities	32–36	14
	1. Legal assistance	32	14
	2. Coordinating assistance for drug control programme	33	14
	3. Priority setting	34	15
	4. Coordination with the United Nations system	35–36	15
	D. Other issues	37–39	16
	1. Legislative guidance	37	16
	2. Effectiveness of programme management	38–39	17
III.	Conclusions	40–42	17

I. Introduction

1. At its thirty-eighth session, the Committee for Programme and Coordination (CPC) considered the report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) on the in-depth evaluation of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme (UNDCP) (E/AC.51/1998/2). The Committee endorsed all 14 recommendations of the report and transmitted it for review and action by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs at its forty-second session.

2. In 1999, at its forty-second session, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs had before it the report on the in-depth evaluation of UNDCP and the relevant part of the report of the CPC containing the conclusions and recommendations of the Committee relating to the in-depth evaluation. Under the same agenda item, the Commission was also considering the programme narrative for international drug control of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2000-2001.[1] The Commission took note of all the documents without comment. In this respect, it should be noted that other governing bodies, such as the Executive Committee of UNHCR and the Governing Council of UNEP, reviewed in detail the CPC recommendations and monitored their implementation over several years.

3. In response to OIOS annual follow-up, the Programme provided OIOS with information on the progress made in implementing the recommendations of the in-depth evaluation.

4. The present triennial review, conducted by OIOS to determine the extent to which the CPC recommendations had been implemented, is based on a review of the relevant documentation, information submitted by UNDCP and other concerned organizations, and consultations with their staff, as well as interviews of government representatives from different regions participating in the work of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs. The review was conducted concurrently, in early 2001, with an OIOS inspection of the programme management of the Office for Drug Control and Crime Prevention (ODCCP). ODCCP was established by the Secretary-General in accordance with his 1997 reform programme. The Office provides a common managerial structure to UNDCP and to the Centre for International Crime Prevention. The OIOS inspection was the first overall review of ODCCP since it was established. In the sections below, reference is generally made to UNDCP, the Programme, which was the subject of the triennial review. References are made to ODCCP, the Office, in relation to management questions that are now addressed at the level of the common managerial structure.

II. Findings

A. Implementing the Conventions

1. Monitoring implementation

Recommendation 1. Support of the United Nations International Drug Control Programme to the International Narcotics Control Board. To maintain INCB capacity to promote the compliance of Governments with the provisions of the treaties and to assist them in this effort, the results of the integration of the Board's secretariat into the Programme should be reviewed, with due attention to areas where the Programme and INCB can obtain stronger mutual support through increased coordination of their programme of work. This review should be coordinated jointly by the Executive Director of the Programme and the Chairman of INCB. The results of the review should be one of the policy documents guiding the formulation of the Programme's work plan for 1999.

5. The International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) is a treaty body responsible for promoting government compliance with the provisions of the three United Nations drug control conventions. It is supported through a separate secretariat within UNDCP, reporting exclusively to the Board on all substantive matters. The secretariat obtains on request additional support from other parts of UNDCP, such as, for example, electronic data processing and legal issues. During the period under review, the work of the Board and its secretariat continued to benefit from collaboration with UNDCP field offices, particularly in the preparation and release of the Board's annual reports. The Board secretariat participated in workshops organized by UNDCP field offices on the requirements of the United Nations drug control conventions.

6. There is no evidence that the review recommended in recommendation 1 took place and that

possibilities for collaboration between the Programme and the INCB were fully explored. However, UNDCP stated to OIOS that the review referred to in recommendation 1 is an ongoing process of consultation between the president of INCB and the Executive Director of UNDCP. During each session of the Board, the Executive Director shares the thrust of the programmatic activities of UNDCP with the Board. In early 2001, after reviewing programme activities in this area, OIOS found that the Board secretariat sought to further develop the informal collaboration that existed previously with other parts of UNDCP. Regarding the formulation of the Programme's work plan referred to in recommendation 1, UNDCP stated to OIOS that the Board secretariat is an integral part of the Division for Treaty Affairs and Support to Drug Control Organs and, accordingly, the work plan of the Board secretariat is an integral part of the work plan of the Division. OIOS believes that the coordinated implementation of divisional work plans needs to be strengthened. The launching of the *World Drug Report 2000*,[2] the second such report, in January 2001, only a few weeks before the *Report of the International Narcotics Control Board 2000*,[3] underscored the need for such coordination. The INCB annual report is an important instrument used by the Board to draw the attention of the international community to "worrying" situations and trends of the world drug problem. For many years the INCB annual report, a requirement of the drug control conventions, has been issued during the first quarter of the year. There was no compelling circumstance to publish the *World Drug Report 2000* — first scheduled for publication in 1999 — in early 2001 when it competed for media attention with the INCB annual report. The two publications were presented in the media as products of the same programme, which is all the more unfortunate as the *World Drug Report* conveyed a different reading of the world drug problem (see para. 28 below).

7. As a consequence of their treaty-mandated monitoring function, it was determined that the Board and its secretariat should be technically independent within and outside the United Nations. They cannot receive contributions from interested Governments and their activities are funded through regular budget resources only. During the 1990s regular budget resources did not increase to match the expansion of the Board's mandates. In spite of these resource constraints, INCB has been looking for ways to contribute, in addition to its monitoring function, in a practical manner to the fight against drug abuse. For example, since 1998, with the participation of Interpol and the World Customs Organization, INCB set up two projects to prevent the illicit diversion of commonly used chemicals. One of the main achievements of these projects was "the real-time information exchange and the integration of the activities of law enforcement and regulatory authorities, including licensing authorities and chemical industries of 23 countries and three international bodies, in tracking individual shipments and in investigating the legitimacy of the operators involved" (E/CN.7/2001/2, para. 239). However, it should be noted that, to this day, the Economic and Social Council request to the Board, in its resolution 1996/20, to intensify its programme of country missions could not be fully implemented owing to budgetary limitations. Also, it has not been possible to carry out, within existing resources, the required analytical and evaluation work to assess worrisome developments which may endanger the treaties. In 1998, the General Assembly urged "Member States to commit themselves in a common effort to assigning adequate and sufficient budgetary resources to the Board" (resolution 53/115, sect. IV, para. 6). The Convention Evaluation Unit, established in 2000 to perform the required analytical and evaluating work, was allocated one Professional post and did not become fully operational. These resource constraints prevented the Board from systematically evaluating the follow-up by Governments to the Board's conclusions and recommendations emanating from its country missions.

2. Assessments of implementation

Recommendation 2. Support of the United Nations Drug Control Programme to assessments of the implementation of conventions. To support the work of INCB and its secretariat and of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, the Executive Director of the Programme should assign responsibility to review and evaluate national and multilateral drug control legislation to one organizational unit of the Programme; this unit should coordinate related work carried out elsewhere within the Programme. Annual reports on the results of this work should be submitted, as appropriate, to INCB and the Commission. The Programme's senior management should utilize these readings of the effectiveness of the conventions to assist their support of government

analysis and to provide a more solid base from which to give advice to Governments.

8. In 1998, to ensure more effective support to the legislative organs, particularly INCB, the ODCCP Executive Director decided to integrate fully the activities of the Legal Affairs Section and the Legal Advisory Programme of UNDCP. Thanks to the complementarity of the work carried out by the two units and their long-standing collaboration, this integration is a step towards implementation of recommendation 2. In 2000, the Legal Section completed phase I of the development of an Internet database of national drug control legislation, covering only legislation adopted since 1990. It is expected that, in the future, the computerized library of all drug control legislation and jurisprudence will facilitate research, comparative studies and analysis by Governments and research institutions of whether legislation complies with the requirements of the drug control conventions and, if not, will facilitate identification of gaps. The assessment by the Executive Director of the efforts of Governments to implement the "measures to promote judicial cooperation", adopted at the twentieth special session of the General Assembly (resolution S-20/4 C), is reflected in the biennial report submitted to the Commission in March 2001.

9. In that respect, government representatives stated to OIOS that an evaluation of the impact of the United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances of 1988, and of the effectiveness of the law enforcement measures it covered, would have been useful to guide the drafting of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the Protocols thereto, adopted on 15 November 2000. Also, there is increasing concern among judicial authorities in many countries about the perceived lack of impact of the justice system on the drug problem and drug-related crime, particularly in dealing with drug abusers. In December 1999, UNDCP convened an expert group meeting to explore this issue. The INCB studied the feasibility of monitoring the progress of parties to the drug control conventions in taking measures against drug abuse and illicit drug trafficking. The Board decided that its secretariat should place more emphasis on carrying out an in-depth review and evaluation of such measures. The limitations of the secretariat to carry out such work were mentioned in paragraph 7 above.

3. Modifying the scope of the conventions' schedules

Recommendation 3. Modifications in the scope of conventions' schedules. Considering the increasing global problem of the use of synthetic drugs and the length of the procedure leading to recommendations to change the scope of relevant conventions' schedules, the Programme should, in close collaboration with WHO, prepare joint Programme/WHO technical suggestions on improving the effectiveness of the present system, without amending the conventions. These suggestions should be presented to INCB and to the Commission in time for its forty-second session, for their consideration and action.

10. In response to the concern about the length of the procedure leading to recommendations to change the scope of relevant conventions' schedules, WHO has simplified this procedure. The revised review procedure now allows the WHO Expert Committee on Drug Dependence to skip the initial "pre-review" in situations where a quick international regulatory decision is needed. The simplified review procedure was applied in 2000 to formulate two recommendations concerning the scheduling of synthetic drugs of illicit origin. UNDCP, through its active participation in the process, has contributed to the amendment of the WHO review procedure.

4. Global monitoring of additional measures recommended by the conventions

Recommendation 4. Global monitoring of additional measures. (a) For issues covered by the conventions under broad prescriptions and for which Governments are developing comprehensive sets of specific measures, the Programme should monitor progress achieved worldwide and report its observations, as appropriate, to INCB and the Commission to help promote further action by the international community; (b) Monitoring, particularly in relation to such issues as money-laundering and demand reduction, should be done in collaboration with other United Nations and regional activities, to ensure that due attention is

paid to aspects that are beyond the scope of the 1961, 1971 and 1988 Conventions.

11. As a result of the measures adopted by the General Assembly at its twentieth special session, in 1998, a number of goals and targets for States were set out for 2003 and 2008, covering the issues referred to in recommendation 4. UNDCP stated to OIOS that the special session has modified the environment in which the recommendations were formulated. In paragraph 20 of the Political Declaration, adopted by its resolution S-20/2 of 10 June 1998, the General Assembly called upon all States to report biennially to the Commission on their efforts to meet the goals and targets for the years 2003 and 2008, and requested the Commission to analyse these reports in order to enhance the cooperative effort to combat the world drug problem. In order for the Commission to monitor effectively the efforts of Governments, the Commission has requested the Executive Director of UNDCP to submit an evaluative report based on information provided by Governments through a questionnaire adopted by the Commission, and other information available to UNDCP. In relation to this matter, the Commission invited the Secretariat to transmit the recommendations and resolutions adopted by the Commission to the regional mechanisms and organizations for their use in accordance with their mandates. Regarding money-laundering, Member States were requested to report on the legislative measures taken to make money-laundering a criminal offence and measures taken to prevent and detect money-laundering. Such reporting provides UNDCP with the tool needed to analyse the impact of actions taken by States on an issue covered in a broad manner by the drug control conventions. It should be noted that the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted on 15 November 2000, broadened the definition of money-laundering and established comprehensive regulatory and supervisory regimes for financial institutions.

12. Monitoring measures for demand reduction is more complex. In 1998, the General Assembly considered that "demand reduction programmes should be based on a regular assessment of the nature and magnitude of drug use and abuse". Assessments should be undertaken by States, "using similar definitions, indicators and procedures to assess the drug situation" and demand reduction strategies "should be built on knowledge acquired from research as well as lessons derived from past programmes" (resolution S-20/3, annex, para. 9). The questionnaire adopted by the Commission (see para. 14 below) to review the progress achieved through demand reduction measures covers, inter alia, political and strategic responses, information resources and methods of working. In early 2001, in its first report on information gathered using the questionnaire, UNDCP noted that it is difficult to judge the merit of individual strategic responses from such simple questions as whether States "have a national strategy for drug demand reduction". (E/CN.7/2001/2, para. 88).

13. UNDCP had stressed that "few Governments have comprehensive demand reduction strategies and programmes in place, and many countries lack the capacity to systematically collect and analyse data and information regarding their drug abuse situation" (E/CN.7/2000/3, para. 33). To support assessments by Governments, UNDCP launched, in 2000, its Global Assessment Programme on Drug Abuse. One of the objectives of the programme is to liaise with existing regional epidemiology networks. Within the next few years, it expects to establish regional networks where they are absent and between 25 and 30 national drug abuse assessment systems. Due to funding limitations, only two out of nine proposed regional subprogrammes were activated in 2000.

B. Implementing the comprehensive strategies

1. Gathering information from Governments

Recommendation 5. Simplifying government reporting requirements. The Programme should, after establishing proper procedures, utilize information collected by regional and other international organizations from national sources. The Programme should limit its requests to Governments to information not already available from regional and international organizations and which is needed for treaty-based requirements or is essential for programme implementation and policy development.

14. The integration of UNDCP reports questionnaire into a single simplified document, which should be coordinated, when appropriate, with other international bodies, as recommended by the Economic and Social Council in 1993, 1994 and 1996, was not achieved. The goal of a single questionnaire could not be pursued.

Currently, Governments report to the United Nations on drug control issues through two questionnaires approved by the Commission: (a) the biennial questionnaire for reporting on the action plans and measures adopted by the General Assembly at its twentieth special session; (b) the UNDCP annual reports questionnaire. With regard to the UNDCP annual reports questionnaire and the question of its streamlining, the Commission, at its forty-third session, in 2000, "reiterating the need to revise the annual reports questionnaire and to make such changes in format as may be appropriate to achieve optimum acceptability and to facilitate its use", decided "to abolish sections 2 and 3 of part II [on demand reduction] of the annual reports questionnaire, since those sections duplicate the new biennial questionnaire" (resolution 43/1, seventh preambular paragraph and operative para. 1). At its forty-fourth session, in 2001, the Commission requested UNDCP to review and streamline the other parts of the questionnaire and to revise the biennial questionnaire for its consideration at its reconvened session in December 2001. As a result, streamlining of the new reporting instruments will be achieved.

15. In the meantime, the UNDCP Information Support Unit continued to develop its national database system. In several countries where the system was tested, national authorities found that the latest version had become a useful tool for both international and domestic management of drug control activities. Among different functions, the system can support the processing of information to respond to UNDCP questionnaires. Limited resources in many countries for the required equipment and licences may slow down installation and use. In this respect, the approval by the General Assembly to use resources from the Development Account to provide information technology support to selected countries was helpful.

16. Steps were taken to simplify government reporting requirements through the coordination of national reporting with other international bodies envisaged by the Economic and Social Council in 1993. For example, the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA) is reviewing what relevant data gathered within the European Community could be incorporated into international monitoring and drug control programmes. The new annual reports questionnaire, part II (see para. 14 above) has been incorporated as fully as possible into the Inter-American Observatory on Drugs (CICAD) revised questionnaire.

2. Information-processing capacity of UNDCP

Recommendation 6. Integrated information system of the Programme. (a) The Programme should designate a chairman for its informal focal group on information issues who would be responsible for the integrated collection and processing of information throughout the Programme; information management and data analysis personnel, deployed in several units and projects, should be accountable to the chairman of the focal group for their contributions to the Programme's integrated information system; (b) The Programme should, as a follow-up to the 1997 expert meeting on drug information, develop and update, in collaboration with other organizations, guidelines and core indicators that can be used by national drug control authorities and international organizations.

17. The UNDCP Information Resources Development Branch — responsible for designing the integrated drug information system of the Programme and providing methodological and technical support — was abolished in 1997. UNDCP decided that the informal focus group on information issues would ensure the necessary coordination across the Programme. The information systems support was centralized in one unit, the Information Support Unit, within the Policy Development and Analysis Branch. In response to OIOS follow-up, at the end of 1998, UNDCP stated that the Chief of the Branch had been designated Chief Information Officer. In this capacity, he was responsible for safeguarding the organization's "corporate" data and knowledge, ensuring its accessibility to staff at headquarters and in the field, as well as its proper management. UNDCP explained to OIOS that, for an organization of its size, this informal arrangement represented a less bureaucratic way of ensuring coordination.

18. It appears that the focus group did not play a very active role and that the management function of the Chief Information Officer was limited to technical aspects of information management. A significant part of the collection, analysis and dissemination of the data was the responsibility of the various units and sections independent of any direct supervision of the Officer. It is noted that, in 1998, to integrate field offices into the

consolidated information system, the ODCCP Intranet was established, enabling the field offices to provide and extract online information from the "corporate" information system. However, two years later, at their 2000 annual meting, UNDCP field representatives considered that communications between headquarters and the field needed significant improvement and they recommended such measures as the rationalization of headquarters inter-office flow of communication to avoid unnecessary messages and duplication of requests from and to the field. These comments describe problems that were already reported in the in-depth evaluation and were the basis for recommendation 6 (a). Technical solutions alone cannot address the issue. It requires a stronger coordination throughout the Programme of all activities which collect, analyse and disseminate information.

19. In 1999, the Research Section of the Policy Development and Analysis Branch, to consolidate data compilation and analysis carried out by several sections in the Branch, initiated the development of a central database — called DELTA — which would be accessible to all UNDCP staff and external counterparts. Staff of the other sections believed that the proposal for better integration of information had merit but that the responsibilities to validate raw data for input in the database needed to be clarified, as well as the linkages between the integrated database and other information databases already developed or in development. In 1999, ODCCP also proposed to standardize field office reporting to facilitate aggregation of information and quick analysis of country specific information. It was expected that project and country profiles prepared for internal use would, once their quality reached adequate standards, be placed on the web site. The Management Instruction which established such a system for field-headquarters reporting was issued only in early 2001. The effectiveness of these new initiatives for an improved management of information, within the Programme, needs to be reviewed by the end of 2002.

20. Recommendation 6 (b) addressed the issue of guidelines and indicators needed to obtain reliable and comparable information. UNDCP considers that limitations in national reporting systems to produce reliable, comprehensive and internationally comparable data are particularly evident in the measurement of illicit crop production and drug abuse. In the domain of illicit crops, problems with data relate to irregularity and incompleteness in national reporting as well as differences in criteria of reporting. The Commission requested that UNDCP "establish a central data bank and information system on the basis of information furnished by Governments on the cultivation of illicit crops" (resolution 42/3, para. 3). In 1999, UNDCP established its Illicit Crops Monitoring Programme, responsible for devising methodological solutions to implementing monitoring systems, and working with Governments to implement these solutions. In the course of 2000, this programme suffered from the lack of attention by UNDCP senior management to requests from associated organizations for further consultations. UNDCP expects that the programme will attain full implementation in 2003 and 2004.

21. In the domain of drug abuse, the General Assembly recommended that similar definitions, indicators and procedures should be used by States to assess the drug situation (see para. 12 above). It was only in January 2000 that a meeting on drug abuse assessments was organized in Lisbon, supported by UNDCP and hosted by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA), in follow-up to the 1997 meeting referred to in recommendation 6 (b). At the meeting, experts agreed on principles for data collection, structures to support an integrated information system and proposals for a list of subject areas that national reporting would cover. The Lisbon meeting represented the first step in a planned process ending with the endorsement of the new revised questionnaire, including the agreed global indicators, at the forty-fourth session of the Commission in March 2001. Between these two events, a number of follow-up activities were undertaken. These include: two further expert group meetings held to agree on the standardized indicators for the new annual reports questionnaire, technical visits by UNDCP staff to regional partners (EMCDDA and CICAD) and other international bodies (WHO, UNAIDS) to discuss harmonizing data, the convening of an international expert review panel to comment on the draft questionnaire and the new indicators, and a field test exercise undertaken in 10 countries. In February 2001, institutions participating in the 2000 meeting stated to OIOS that, considering its mandate to mobilize existing expertise worldwide, UNDCP's convener role is crucial to further advance the work on practical and methodological issues involved.

3. Analytical activities and issues

Recommendation 7. A more active role for the Programme Laboratory. The Programme Laboratory, in addition to its regular programme of work and within existing mandates, should take timely initiatives to carry out or coordinate research on, inter alia, new drugs of abuse, health aspects of drug abuse and new technologies of interest for drug control programmes.

22. Good progress was made in the implementation of recommendation 7 by the UNDCP Laboratory/ Scientific Section through strengthened cooperation with national institutions in applied research, collaborative efforts to evaluate modern technology for drug detection and testing, and drug impurity profiling. The network of laboratories was expanded and samples of seized drugs and analytical results were exchanged to develop operational intelligence activities, including identification of emerging drug manufacturing trends. The Scientific Section increased its support of law enforcement authorities in their operational activities. Law enforcement personnel must be able to recognize the various classes of drugs encountered. To meet these requirements the Scientific Section developed drug and precursor identification kits for use by law enforcement agencies. In 2000, more than 800 drug and precursor testing kits were produced and distributed to law enforcement agencies in 23 countries.

23. The Scientific Section continued to develop its programme on quality assurance and good laboratory practices. This work is particularly important to enhance the performance of national drug testing laboratories. The acceptance of laboratories' analytical results by national courts of law is a major factor in conviction rates in drug-related cases. Participation of drug testing laboratories in the quality assurance exercises operated by the Scientific Section increased from 40 national laboratories in the first round of 1995, to 160 laboratories in 2000. This increase shows the national laboratories' interest in this programme.

4. Advocacy

Recommendation 8. Dissemination of information. (a) By the end of 1998, the Programme should adopt a strategy, in conformity with mandates given to the Programme, to ensure that the institutional and specialized information available to it is made accessible to all government personnel and professional groups involved in drug control activities; (b) The Programme should develop its global clearing house function, starting with the priority mandates given to the United Nations in the Global Programme of Action. In this respect, the Programme should conceive its role primarily as a facilitator for the exchange of information, not a repository of it, taking into account systems already in place worldwide at the global, regional or subregional levels.

24. The General Assembly, at its twentieth special session, stressed the importance of exchange and sharing of information at several levels: from confidential information useful to law enforcement authorities to the open sharing of information and experiences resulting from the implementation of national drug control strategies. In response to OIOS follow-up, UNDCP stated, in 2000, that since the special session it had made progress in providing Governments with institutional and specialized information. In paragraph 8 above, the development of the legal database was mentioned. Other examples of easier access to information include the publication of drug-related resolutions and decisions taken since 1946 and the posting on the Internet of all issues published since 1949 of the *Bulletin on Narcotics*. However, the recommended strategy was not adopted. Due to the lack of a unified approach to the processing of information, reviewed in paragraphs 18 and 19 above, the new initiatives reported were developed within the boundaries of specific units or programmes. As a result, no significant progress was noted regarding the dissemination of material such as country profiles and lessons learned which required the coordinated action of different parts of UNDCP.

25. There was little progress as well in the development of the clearing house function, recommended to strengthen the role of the United Nations as an information centre on the drug problem. This function is still of interest to Member States. For example, in 1999, in the Action Plan for the Implementation of the Declaration on the Guiding Principles of Drug Demand Reduction, the General Assembly recommended that UNDCP and other relevant organizations participate in the creation of an international mechanism, "to provide a network of information on knowledge and experiences" (resolution 54/132, sect. V, annex, para. 22). The programme

budget for the biennium 2000-2001, in paragraph 15.38, provided for activities "to prepare the foundation for the cooperation with relevant partners for the establishment of the information clearing house".[1] It should be noted that, in the meantime, a number of United Nations and other relevant international organizations are already collaborating in the development and maintenance of clearing house mechanisms. Participants in these mechanisms stated to OIOS that, before 1998, UNDCP was more actively involved in this work. They were informed by UNDCP staff that the Programme needed to clarify a number of conceptual issues, such as the appropriateness of its participation in international networks covering substance abuse more broadly than it was mandated to do. *Regarding the implementation of recommendation 8, in its comments on an earlier draft of the present report, UNDCP stated that the main challenge in improving its information resources is not simply coordinating the integration of different data sources. Rather, a technical agenda has to be advanced which requires the building of partnerships with other relevant bodies supported by appropriate technical competencies at UNDCP.*

26. The UNDCP web site remained, primarily, an advocacy vehicle for the Programme's activities which is, in OIOS views, a legitimate purpose as long as "every attempt [is] made to ensure credibility, avoid sensationalism, promote trust and enhance effectiveness" (General Assembly resolution S-20/3, annex, para. 15). UNDCP ensures that its information on the drug problem reflects these fundamental qualities. Responding to OIOS queries on the implementation of recommendation 8, UNDCP stated that it made significant efforts in providing Governments with institutional and specialized information, an example of such information being its *World Drug Report*. Unfortunately, it appears that, in the case of the *Report 2000*,[2] UNDCP was not able to maintain an appropriate balance between advocacy and credibility. It is worth noting that the *Report 2000* was prepared by a team under the direct supervision of the Executive Director without guidance of a UNDCP coordinating committee as had been done for the 1997 edition of the *Report*. This case is reviewed briefly in the following paragraphs.

27. Two years ago, the General Assembly requested that UNDCP continue "the publication of the *World Drug Report* with comprehensive and balanced information about the world drug problem" (resolution 53/115, sect. IV, para. 2 (d)). *Report 2000* was issued in early 2001 with only three chapters — recent trends, demand reduction, alternative development — and a lengthy 21-page introduction signed by the Executive Director — an advocacy essay highlighting "the track record of the organization [UNDCP, which] is one that merits additional financial support" (p. 21). This coverage of issues represents only a fraction of the contents of the 1997 *Report*. *Report 2000* does not have a chapter on synthetic drugs although the General Assembly considered that global awareness of this problem is insufficient and should be given higher priority. A chapter on these drugs had been prepared by the research team for the 2000 edition but it was removed before publication. There is also no section on issues such as the link between illicit drugs and organized crime. The *Report* appears to ignore as well both enforcement and corruption. No explanation is offered as to why the discussion of supply-side policies is restricted to alternative development, though expenditures for enforcement are much larger than for any other supply reduction measures.

28. Another weakness of this "global overview of the drug issue" — as the Secretary-General still refers to *Report 2000* — is that it stresses "positive developments on the drugs front" beyond the limits of credibility. *Report 2000* opens with a list of successes in a few countries to curb the production and trafficking of illicit drugs — success sometimes due to extraneous factors such as weather conditions — and suggests a causal link to "consumption trends of the main problem drugs in the developed countries [which] have been stable or declining" during the 1990s. The claim applies to cocaine and heroin abuse only, which represents no more than one sixth of drug abuse cases according to UNDCP's own estimates. The annual report of the INCB, published one month after the *Report 2000* (see para. 6 above), highlights a contrasting picture. From the data analysed by the INCB, it is concluded that cocaine abuse in Europe has increased and that, regarding the United States, the abuse of cocaine and heroin either has remained stable or decreased slightly while synthetic drugs are causing increasing concern. *Report 2000* recalls that the main reason for publishing the *Report* "was the need to have a sober and neutral set of data and analysis about drugs in the world" and asserts that "today, we are increasingly confident that we know what we say we know, and know what we need to know" (p. 19). This

is in stark contrast to the claim made in *Global Illicit Drug Trends 2000*,[4] published a few months earlier by the same UNDCP research team, which stated that, as problems with regard to data effect "the quantity, quality and comparability of information received ... currently available results presented in this report must therefore be interpreted with a large degree of caution" (pp. 218-219). *In its comments on an earlier draft of the present report, UNDCP stated that the implicit accusation that the content of the* World Drug Report *was manipulated by leaving out information on amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS), is factually not correct. All information referring to trends of amphetamine-type stimulants (ATS) is published in the* World Drug Report, *mainly as part of the chapter on trafficking (pp. 51-55) and on consumption (pp. 57-59, 62-63, 65, 68-69, and 72-78). The general problems and challenges of ATS for drug control were addressed in the Introduction (pp. 5 and 16-18). In addition, a large number of references to ATS have been made throughout the report (pp. 34-35, 55-56, 59-61, 70, 89-90, 118-119, 128, 144). However, the report also shows that ATS, at the global level, are still far less of a problem drug than heroin or cocaine (p. 58). The fact that corruption was not explicitly dealt with in the* World Drug Report *has to do with the institutional set up of ODCCP and to avoid duplication with the publication of the Centre for International Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice. CICP published a global report on the crime situation which, inter alia, deals with issues of corruption. The draft report claims that the* World Drug Report *stresses the "positive developments on the drugs front ... beyond the limits of credibility" (para. 28). The* World Drug Report *cites concrete examples of success to back its conclusions, that the reduction of opium production in Thailand or Pakistan, the declines in coca production in Peru and Bolivia are major success stories. With regard to the statement that no causal link was made between the stabilization of abuse of the main problem drugs — cocaine in Northern America and heroin in Western Europe — and production is not accurate (see para. 28), the* World Drug Report *indicates that demand reduction efforts in both the United States of America and Western Europe were the primary reason for the stabilization of abuse (pp. 85-100). Contrary to what is stated in paragraph 28, there is no contradiction between the* World Drug Report *and the INCB report regarding cocaine abuse trends in Europe. A further point of criticism in paragraph 28 is the statement in the Introduction to the* World Drug Report *that "today, we are increasingly confident that we know what we say we know, and know what we need to know", which according to the draft report stands in contrast to the publication* Global Illicit Drug Trends. *While UNDCP has better knowledge about the global drug situation than it had a couple of years ago and is thus in a better position to make statements with a higher degree of confidence, it is at the same time, very much aware of the limitations of the knowledge available. This has also been made explicit, wherever appropriate, in the* World Drug Report, *which contains a large number of caveats to this effect: chapter 1.1 (p. 23), figure 7 of chapter 1.1 (p. 28), (pp. 30-32); chapter 1.2 (pp. 36-37).*

> *Recommendation 9. Promoting collaborative efforts.* In compliance with existing mandates, the Programme should promote collaborative efforts in each of its major areas of responsibility. This should be done, to the extent possible, through government-sponsored activities, intergovernmental organizations, existing non-governmental organization networks and professional or scientific associations. A strategy to constitute such broadly based alliances should be developed by the end of 1998 and presented to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs at its forty-second session.

29. UNDCP considers that strategies approved by the General Assembly at its twentieth special session, as reflected in the medium-term plan for the period 1998-2001, provide the basis for implementing recommendation 9. The specific elements of collaboration, with Member States, intergovernmental organizations, research institutes and NGOs, are taking several forms. They are elaborated, for example, in country plans targeting specific issues, the plan for estimating the extent of demand for illicit drugs and the programme development framework for an international monitoring mechanism for illicit narcotic crops. In a few areas, such as the Scientific Section and the Legal Advisory Programme, collaboration continues with other institutions and professional groups on a technical level, to update standards, methodologies or model legislations. A number of field projects are attempting to develop national or subregional networks. UNDCP considers that it has made significant progress to implement recommendation 9 in the light of the outcome of the

twentieth special session of the General Assembly and that it convened a large number of international expert meetings.

30. However, as noted in paragraphs 21 and 25 above, collaboration was not always pursued very actively by UNDCP. In connection with the role of UNDCP as the main centre for concerted international action for drug abuse control, the 1998 OIOS evaluation of UNDCP stated that "increased collaboration with organizations conducting relevant research is needed" and that "in programme areas where the Programme is formulating far-reaching strategies, supporting evidence from centres with different expertise, and not necessarily agreeing in principle with the Programme, would better convince policy makers of the adequacy of the proposed course of action" (E/AC.51/1998/2, para. 43). There is no evidence of increased collaboration in the form envisaged. International expert meetings convened by UNDCP to engage in substantive discussions that would shape the formulation of UNDCP policies and strategies through a process of critical review are not a frequent occurrence. No one, at UNDCP and among government representatives in the Commission, interviewed by OIOS in early 2001, could cite any specific examples of such gatherings. In a related matter, to improve its programme quality, ODCCP proposed, in 1999, to establish four Panels of Experts to identify UNDCP best practices and to scrutinize what works and what does not in its four main programme subject areas. The proposed mechanism was deemed cumbersome by the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions and was not adopted. In 2000, UNDCP discontinued attending some important international meetings on drug abuse issues central to its mandate, although these meetings were still attended by organizations such as ILO, WHO and regional organizations. Most of the high-level international meetings organized by UNDCP since 1997 took place for general advocacy purpose and promotion of UNDCP programmes. The lack of substantive backing for a number of UNDCP programmes is exemplified by the manner in which the programme for the elimination of illicit drug crops, particularly in Afghanistan, was launched, a case reviewed briefly, as described in the following paragraph.

31. In September 1997, the new Executive Director decided to formulate a global strategy to eliminate the illicit cultivation of drug crops. The strategy paper was drafted in November 1997, primarily with in-house expertise. Outside expertise was sought in remote-sensing methodology only. Other organizations were asked to comment on the strategy a few months later. At the end of 1997, these organizations commented to OIOS that the goal of the global effort, namely to eliminate illicit coca and poppy production in 10 years seems rather unrealistic. They regretted that the relevant expertise that exists in other parts of the United Nations had not been tapped by UNDCP to define its strategy. Considering the size of the proposed activities in Afghanistan, a group of donors sent an appraisal mission there at the end of 1997. The mission concluded that UNDCP needed to prepare a more coherent policy framework for drug control in the country and that a programme aimed at the total elimination of poppies in a sustainable way was premature and would have little credibility. UNDCP refused to delay the proposal. SCOPE — the Strategy for Coca and Opium Poppy Elimination — was launched in March 1998. The implementation of the strategy was pursued by means of the development of business plans at the national level in major producing countries. For the period 2000-2001, funding for the elimination of illicit crops was not forthcoming as projected. The revised budget of the UNDCP Fund shows a 37 per cent downward revision in this sector from the funding level approved in the initial budget, a reduction more severe than in any other sector of the Programme. In Afghanistan — a priority programme for UNDCP — the production of opium doubled between 1997 and 1999. The decrease of production in 2000, attributed to prolonged drought, did not represent a substantial change in the situation. UNDCP announced, at the end of 2000, that the Afghanistan alternative development project would be closed in view of lack of financial support from donors. *In its comments on an earlier draft of the present report, UNDCP stated that its Afghanistan programme was launched in March 1997 with a duration until June 2001 and a total budget of $16.4 million. It consisted of four projects: capacity-building for drug control, with a budget of $2.7 million; drug control monitoring system, with a budget of $1.8 million; poppy crop reduction, with a budget of $10.5 million; demand reduction support, with a budget of $1.3 million. The programme was of a pilot nature and the poppy crop reduction project targeted only four districts, three in Qandahar province and one in Nangarhar province 51.*

The funding of the programme as at 31 December 2000 stood at $10.5 million, out of which $9.2 million was from donors special purpose contributions and $1.2 million from donors general purpose contributions. In view of the prevailing political and working circumstances in Afghanistan, to have sustained donor interest and funding for the pilot programme during the past two to three years, and a programme funded at the level of 64 per cent is quite a remarkable achievement by all standards. It should be highlighted that only the activities related to the poppy crop reduction project were closed in December 2000 owing to lack of funds. The activities of the other three projects are continuing in 2001 and future years: mainstreaming the drug dimension into other United Nations agency work (capacity-building); monitoring of poppy cultivation; demand reduction. These factors are a permanent feature of UNDCP work in Afghanistan, and donors are committed to support such activities. UNDCP has also recognized, in its proposal for the expanded Afghanistan programme, as essential prerequisites for success the involvement and commitment of Afghan authorities to the elimination of opium poppy cultivation, including the enforcement of imposed bans; the provision of donors funds at adequate levels; and coordinated efforts by United Nations and other agencies in the campaign against poppy cultivation. To conclude, through the expanded Afghanistan programme proposal, UNDCP managed to produce a strategy involving the region, which is funded at a level varying from $10-12 million per year. With the proclaimed ban of the opium-poppy cultivation by the Taliban in the year 2001, a donors mission is now returning to Afghanistan to make an assessment of how the ban can be sustained and to propose short- and medium-term strategies for the former opium poppy growers.

C. Operational activities

1. Legal assistance

Recommendation 10. Legal Advisory Programme. (a) When legal assistance is requested by Governments to adopt or adjust drug control legislation and relevant administrative measures, such assistance should include support for effective implementation; the Programme's legal workshops should help resolve implementation problems related, for example, to adjustments to existing national penal codes; (b) The Programme should identify new potential regional working partners and evaluate and improve joint work with existing ones, in particular to develop further the training of prosecutors and judges; (c) The allocation of resources should permit the Legal Advisory Programme, by itself or through collaborating institutions, to respond to government requests, particularly with respect to monitoring the implementation of legislation, to advise on further adjustments needed and to provide the additional assistance that may be required.

32. The integrated work programme of the Legal Affairs Section and the Legal Advisory Programme, with such initiatives as the development of the computerized library on drug control legislation (see para. 8 above) and the publication of the *Maritime Drug Law Enforcement Training Guide*, contributes to the implementation of recommendation 10. Also, since the 1998 OIOS evaluation, as the majority of States parties to the conventions had completed their legislative upgrading, the Legal Advisory Programme devoted more time to address the difficulties of implementing legislation encountered by the parties. The training of prosecutors and judges constituted the new focus of the work of the Programme. UNDCP is attempting to improve the impact of its legal assistance work by greater decentralization of legal assistance activities to the field. In 2000, regional legal advisers were outposted to three priority regions. One of the objectives is to build up expertise in the field offices so that activities such as training seminars and monitoring of national legal work, and support to it, can be conducted directly from the field.

2. Coordinating assistance for drug control programme

Recommendation 11. Support to Governments in the planning of drug control programmes. (a) To assist in the implementation of government drug control programmes, the Programme should assess needs and identify multilateral and bilateral resources available and gaps in resources. In doing so, the Programme should take into account its earlier experience with the Coordination Mechanism used in central and Eastern Europe and apply that Mechanism to all programmes in the form needed to complement

coordination arrangements already in place, (b) A focal point for the coordination of drug control training should be re-established in the Programme by the end of 1998; the focal point should ensure that, in the planning of its assistance programmes, the Programme identifies drug control training resources existing within and outside the United Nations system, and takes action to ensure the well-coordinated use of those resources and to resolve gaps in assistance provided by the international community.

33. Since the 1998 OIOS evaluation, UNDCP has not developed new mechanisms for the coordination of multilateral and bilateral drug control assistance programmes. In response to OIOS follow-up, UNDCP stated, at the end of 1998, that greater emphasis is being given to international financial institutions, particularly the World Bank and regional development banks, to ensure coordinated assistance to targeted regions. The UNDCP Coordination Mechanism used in central and eastern Europe was phased out. Government representatives in the Commission stated to OIOS that coordinating mechanisms set up by donors, such as the Dublin Group — and "mini" Dublin Groups at the regional and country levels — attempted to coordinate the flow of assistance made available by their Governments.

3. Priority setting

Recommendation 12. Strategies aimed at reducing significant elements of the global drug problem. The Programme should formulate, by the end of the United Nations Decade against Drug Abuse, separate comprehensive proposals for action aimed at reducing significant elements of the global drug problem for the seven core areas of concern set out in the Global Programme of Action. Such proposals for action should make full use of the activities of the organizations of the United Nations system and the development programmes of other multilateral institutions and should include a monitoring mechanism.

34. UNDCP intended to implement this recommendation in the context of the follow-up to the twentieth special session, at which the General Assembly adopted action plans representing the strategic focus for drug control during the next decade, with specific target dates and objectives. Paragraph 1 of the Political Declaration adopted at the special session stressed the need to reduce both illicit supply of and the demand for drugs. As the data needed to monitor and evaluate progress towards these goals are not yet available, UNDCP formulated two priority programmes: the global programme to monitor the cultivation of illicit crops and the global assessment programme on drug abuse. As mentioned in paragraph 13 above, these two programmes did not receive the expected level of voluntary contributions. Regarding the funding difficulties, government representatives stated to OIOS that the Executive Director had, throughout the year, presented to them many new initiatives, all promoted as equally important. In the process, they sometimes lost track of the progress of previous initiatives. The overall impression was that the Programme priorities had shifted. As new demands made on donors were not reconciled with the need to sustain previous initiatives, the latter became underfunded. At a recent informal meeting, major donors concluded that, in order to enhance the efficiency of UNDCP, the Programme needed to concentrate financial and human resources on a smaller number of sustainable projects, focused on the thematic priorities of the twentieth special session of the General Assembly. Priorities should then be kept from one year to the next. The Commission sets the priorities of UNDCP. The 1998 OIOS evaluation reported that "the link between the adoption of mandates and the funding of activities remained weak" and that "a mechanism for wider consultations during programme implementation could have offered needed guidance" (E/AC.51/1998/2, para. 63). Since 1998, the Commission adopted several measures to address the problem (see para. 37 below).

4. Coordination with the United Nations system

Recommendation 13. Coordination within the United Nations system. (a) The Programme should use the United Nations System-wide Action Plan on Drug Abuse Control primarily as a strategic framework to encourage interaction at the working level between relevant units of programmes and agencies of the United Nations system, with a view to promoting the programming and coordinated implementation of drug control-related activities. Within the context of the ACC Subcommittee on Drug Control, the Programme should monitor these activities in relation to the main goals of the System-wide Action Plan; (b) The Programme should develop

collaborative arrangements with all United Nations specialized agencies that have programmes relevant to the seven core areas of concern set out in the Global Programme of Action; collaborative arrangements should take into account, at the country level, the capacity of the United Nations Resident Coordinator system.

35. Adding support to recommendation 13, the High-Level Group convened in 1998 to review UNDCP (see para. 37 below) recommended that the System-wide Action Plan "develop into a strategic planning tool" for collaboration and considered that "a significant increase in cooperation between UNDCP and UNDP is indispensable for the success of drug control" (E/CN.7/1999/5, paras. 22 and 25). In 1998, the ACC Subcommittee on Drug Control decided to develop an umbrella framework for inter-agency coordination in drug control. Also, the Subcommittee adopted an Interim Action Plan for inter-agency support to national implementation of the outcome of the twentieth special session of the General Assembly. In 2000, apart from UNDCP, no other agency member of the Subcommittee had gathered information on the status of implementation of the Interim Action Plan at the country level. As a measure of the interest in the work of the Subcommittee, it is noted that the number of organizations represented at its meetings decreased from 15 in 1995 to 9 in 2000. The interest of UNDCP itself in coordination with other agencies was in question. A few initiatives were taken, such as the new cooperation with UNAIDS. However, from several areas of the system, representatives stated to OIOS that they kept making proposals for joint programmes to UNDCP but that it was difficult to get reactions from the Programme. Furthermore, UNDCP rarely made proposals on its own. The ACC Subcommittee noted, in 2000, that a lack of communication had led to various cases of duplication by UNDCP and WHO. UNDCP explained that it had encountered difficulties in obtaining funding for joint programmes submitted by specialized agencies due to earmarking by donors which fund 90 per cent of UNDCP programmes. Some agencies expect UNDCP to raise all the funding for such projects. About 60 per cent of the funds for operational activities are allocated to specialized agencies and organizations for the implementation of joint programmes and projects.

36. Since the early 1990s, at the country level, UNDCP had promoted the establishment under the Resident Coordinator system of inter-agency thematic groups focusing on the drug control problem. Very few of these groups have been successful at integrating drug control programmes into the overall national development strategies. Since 1997, the development of United Nations Development Assistance Frameworks (UNDAFs) has provided an opportunity to include specific drug control issues in broader strategies. UNDCP has actively contributed to the country cooperation assessment/UNDAF concept, with a view to ensuring that drug control is reflected in the process. In the 18 countries covered by the Interim Action Plan, the number of thematic groups on drugs had increased from 5 to 10. In most of these 10 countries it is expected that drug control issues would be included in their UNDAFs. In 2000, the ACC Subcommittee agreed that the ACC should provide guidance to the United Nations country teams to increase the attention given to drug control issues in UNDAF documents. The Subcommittee hoped that the adoption of its draft Guidance Note by ACC would obviate the need for either the Interim Action Plan or a distinct cooperation framework. The Guidance Note was approved by the ACC High-Level Committee on Programmes at its spring session in 2001.

D. Other issues

1. Legislative guidance

Recommendation 14. Legislative guidance and capacity to implement programmes. The Programme should propose to the Commission at its forty-second session procedures for obtaining inter-sessional legislative guidance to deal with changing circumstances and funding problems that would otherwise impair its ability to implement programmes promptly in agreement with mandated priorities.

37. In 1998 the Secretary-General convened a High-Level Expert Group pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 1997/37, to review the international drug control programme and to strengthen the United Nations machinery for international drug control. On the question of the governance of the Programme, the Commission noted the findings of the OIOS 1998 evaluation and recommendation 14 (E/CN.7/1999/5, para. 55). The Expert Group concluded that, to enhance the capacity of the Commission to fulfil its mandate as the governing body of UNDCP, it would be important

for ministers to participate in the sessions of the Commission and that the annual sessions should be reorganized to remedy a fragmented consideration of the drug issue (ibid., paras. 57-59). The Commission deliberated on the recommendations of the Expert Group and approved a draft resolution, which the Economic and Social Council adopted in 1999. As a result, the agenda of the Commission was subsequently reorganized in two main substantive segments: a normative segment and an operational segment. The Economic and Social Council indicated that, during the latter segment, the Commission should exercise its role as the governing body of UNDCP and consider issues related to the provision of policy guidance to the Programme. The Commission did not agree on the recommendation made by the Expert Group to address the problem of insufficient inter-sessional guidance by establishing an extended bureau of the Commission. In paragraph 3 of its resolution 44/15, adopted in March 2001, the Commission requested the Executive Director of UNDCP to convene "informal joint meetings, at regular intervals, of donor and recipient countries on the planning and formulation of the operational activities of the Programme".

2. Effectiveness of programme management

38. The Drug Control Programme contributed to the preparatory process and successful outcome of the 1998 twentieth special session of the General Assembly. As had been the case after the seventeenth special session of the General Assembly on illicit drugs, in 1990, the voluntary contributions made to UNDCP increased (see table below).

Fund of UNDCP
Annual contributions collected, 1989-2000
(in millions of United States dollars)

Year	*1989*	*1990*	*1991*	*1992*	*1993*	*1994*	*1995*	*1996*	*1997*	*1998*	*1999*	*2000**
	48.4	64.5	70.2	74.8	48.6	46.1	64.0	37.3	50.4	54.7	54.4	44.9

Source: UNDCP fund-raising data.
* Estimate as of 12 January 2001.

In both instances, UNDCP capacity to increase programme delivery could not match budget targets. At mid-point of the 1998-1999 biennium, actual project expenditures had reached only 33 per cent of the projected level for the period. Efforts to improve programme delivery were undertaken and total programme expenditure for the biennium reached 85 per cent of the approved budget. *In its comments on an earlier draft of the present report, UNDCP stated that the contributions collected vary according to UNDCP funding requirements and should be complemented with data on pledges, including cost-sharing, which reflect more appropriately donor trends in contributions. Data show significant increases in pledged contributions over the last three years. In 2000 the level of contributions further increased. There was, however, a small decrease in the income, primarily due to adverse rate of exchange — a 5.4 per cent drop. Therefore, the table above shows a distorted picture of the funding situation. Moreover, the 2001 report of the Executive Director on the activities of UNDCP states that "UNDCP improved its efficiency in programme delivery, as reflected in the balance in the use of resources, with 79 per cent going to programmes and 21 per cent to support activities. That represents an improvement over 1998-1999" (E/CN.7/2001/7, para. 147).*

39. Issues of programme management were raised in the 1998 OIOS evaluation. Among the issues were a low level of programme implementation, the absence of clear criteria for establishing field offices, a slow process for project review and approval. There were also concerns expressed about uneconomical programme practices and insufficient delegation of authority. At the time, UNDCP had stated that it "is currently undergoing a major exercise to decentralize its operations and streamline organizational responsibilities and procedures" and that the issues raised by OIOS "are of central concern in this reform exercise" (E/AC.51/1998/2, para. 61). In March 1998, the Programme issued a series of management instructions outlining the main points of its management reform. The current status of these issues of programme management is reviewed in the OIOS report on the inspection of the programme management of ODCCP.

III. Conclusions

40. **Activities of the Drug Control Programme that were performing well at the time of the 1998 OIOS evaluation continued to provide satisfactory services during the period under review, 1998-2000. In particular, activities with a mandate directly**

derived from treaty provisions or those providing services to a well-defined professional group were able to adjust their programmes to evolving circumstances and to provide additional services. This is the case with the secretariat of the International Narcotics Control Board, the Legal Advisory units and the Scientific Section. Their work contributed to good progress in the implementation of CPC recommendations 1, 2, 7 and 10. Technical assistance appears to have been most effective when it was provided in conjunction with subregional strategies formulated before 1998. A number of new programmes or programmes already established that needed to be significantly enhanced — such as the global programmes for demand reduction and for the monitoring of illicit crops, as well as country programmes in the Middle East and Central Asia, particularly in the sector of elimination of illicit crops — had not yet attracted the expected level of voluntary contributions.

41. The Drug Control Programme benefited from the successful outcome of the twentieth special session of the General Assembly, in 1998. During the preparatory process, UNDCP supported governments in designing innovative global strategies in all sectors of drug control. The action plans adopted at the twentieth special session of the General Assembly provided a clear framework for the implementation of recommendation 4, on global monitoring of additional measures for drug control, and recommendation 12, on strategies aimed at reducing significant elements of the global drug problem. In follow-up to the special session, the Commission on Narcotic Drugs took steps to simplify government reporting — recommendation 5 — and to enhance its capacity to provide legislative guidance to UNDCP — recommendation 14.

42. Other recommendations, which required coordinated and continued efforts throughout the Programme, had not been implemented in a manner that addressed underlying problems identified in the 1998 evaluation. For example, the coordination of the collection and processing of information is still inadequate. Problems in organizing and sharing information that were addressed in recommendation 6 persist. Regarding recommendation 9, renewed efforts were made to develop collaboration among institutions in a few countries. However, the role of UNDCP as the main centre for concerted international action for drug abuse control, the basis for recommendations 8 and 9, was given insufficient attention. UNDCP needs to participate more actively with other organizations in the development of information networks, as mandated by the General Assembly. The Programme should create more opportunities for substantive dialogue with other organizations on issues central to its mandates. Recent initiatives with regional organizations, such as the Congress in Bangkok with ASEAN, combined with new measures regarding the follow-up to the twentieth special session of the General Assembly will enable the Programme to create more opportunities for substantive work with other partners. Considering the existing problems with the reliability and comparability of data on the drug situation, UNDCP should promote more vigorously activities for the development of appropriate methodologies for assessing the drug problem and for building the capacity of national agencies in this area. Different aspects of this issue were covered by recommendations 4, 5, 6, 8 and 9, and progress, in this respect, was uneven. Considering its mandate to mobilize existing expertise worldwide, the UNDCP convener role is crucial to further advance the work on the practical and methodological issues involved.

(*Signed*) Dileep Nair
Under-Secretary-General
for Internal Oversight Services

Notes

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 6* (A/54/6/Rev.1).

[2] United Nations publication, Sales No. E.GV.00.0.10.

[3] United Nations publication, Sales No. E.01.XI.1.

[4] United Nations publication, Sales No. E.00.XI.10.